



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

AD  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

| APPLICATION NO.  | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/817,324   | 03/26/2001  | Barry Lynn Royer     | 200IP04786US        | 8852             |
| 7590   | 08/23/2005  |                      | EXAMINER            |                  |
| Siemens Corporation<br>Intellectual Property Department<br>186 Wood Avenue South<br>Iselin, NJ 08830 |             |                      | DAVIS, ZACHARY A    |                  |
|  |             |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |
|  |             |                      | 2137                |                  |

DATE MAILED: 08/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

|                 |                  |              |              |
|-----------------|------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Application No. | 09/817,324       | Applicant(s) | ROYER ET AL. |
| Examiner        | Zachary A. Davis | Art Unit     | 2137         |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 June 2005.
- 2a)  This action is FINAL.      2b)  This action is non-final.
- 3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4)  Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6)  Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10)  The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a)  All    b)  Some \* c)  None of:
  1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6)  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. A Request for Continued Examination with amendment was received on 15 June 2005. Claims 1-4, 6, 9, 11, 14, 19, 21, and 23 have been amended. No claims have been added or canceled. Claims 1-23 are currently pending in the present application.

***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3, 5-10, and 12-23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
3. Applicant's arguments filed 15 June 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding Claim 2, Applicant argues that the Claim is patentable over Cohen et al, US Patent 6178511, and Levergood et al, US Patent 5708780. Specifically, Applicant argues that Cohen and Levergood do not teach or suggest communicating application specific context information in a data field of a URL. Regarding Claim 1, Applicant further argues that Cohen and Levergood do not disclose context information at all. However, the Examiner notes that the present application defines context information to include a session identifier (page 5, lines 28-29 of the present specification), and Applicant acknowledges that at least Levergood discloses a session identifier. The Examiner further believes that Levergood does disclose communicating

application specific context information, further defined in Claim 2 as comprising a user identifier, in a data field of a URL (column 5, lines 56-61).

Applicant further argues that Cohen and Levergood do not teach or suggest encrypting an address portion of a URL link, and more specifically that the cited portions of Levergood (column 3, lines 34-37; column 5, lines 61-65) instead disclose an accessible domain that is not a URL or an address portion of a URL. Applicant further states that the domain is defined as a "collection of controlled files of common protection within one or more servers". The Examiner notes that if the domain includes a collection of files within a server, then the domain must include an identification and/or address for these files. Therefore, the Examiner believes that the domain can include an address portion of a URL.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the motivation was as stated in the previous Office action, namely to allow access to all files within a controlled domain without requiring additional authorization beyond an initial authorization (see Levergood, column 3, lines 50-55).

Therefore, for the reasons detailed above, the Examiner maintains the rejection of Claim 2 as set forth below.

Regarding Claim 4, Applicant argues that Cohen and Levergood do not teach or suggest dynamic compilation of a database. The Examiner first notes that the claim does not recite that the database is compiled *dynamically*, merely that a database is compiled. That distinction notwithstanding, the Examiner believes that the cited portions of Cohen do, in fact, suggest that the database can be modified dynamically (see column 5, lines 5-6, where passwords in the database are managed, i.e. they can be changed and are therefore dynamic; see also column 5, lines 45-58 where the logon targets can be created, updated, and deleted).

Applicant also argues that Cohen and Levergood do not disclose the recited authentication service identifier and corresponding user identifier. However, the Examiner believes that the cited portion of Cohen does disclose both a user identifier (column 4, lines 64-67, where a username and passwords are stored in the database) and an authentication service identifier (column 5, lines 1-2, where domain, host, and application names are stored; also column 5, lines 45-58 where logon targets are defined in the database).

Regarding Claim 11, Applicant argues that Cohen and Levergood do not teach or suggest communicating a parameter indicating success or failure. The Examiner respectfully disagrees, noting that the cited portion does indeed disclose a parameter indicating success or failure (the return codes of column 10, lines 35-37, noting that the

immediately preceding section further describes a single sign-on where a username and password are presented to logon to a domain).

The above arguments also apply to the arguments regarding Claims 6, 14, and 21 that specifically refer to the arguments cited in reference to the claims above. As noted above, other arguments referring to these claims are rendered moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Specification***

4. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: The specification does not provide proper antecedent basis for the limitation “said application specific context information supporting acquisition from said second application of information associated with a current operational context of said first application” in Claims 1, 6, 14, 21, and 23. The specification makes no reference to a “current operational context” of any application, nor does the specification make a specific reference to “acquisition” of any sort of information. Although Applicant’s remarks (page 9 of the current response) state that support for the limitation is found in the Application, the cited portion, reading “The application specific data is tailored to meet the intended function of a target application” (page 5, lines 33-35 of the present specification) is much broader than the claimed limitation and does not

provide 35 U.S.C. 112 compliant enabling disclosure of the limitation as recited and claimed. See below regarding the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6. Claims 1 and 3-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Independent Claims 1, 6, 14, 21, and 23 each recite the limitation "said application specific context information supporting acquisition from said second application of information associated with a current operational context of said first application". There is no mention in the specification of a current operational context of any application, nor of the acquisition of any data. See above regarding the objection the specification. Claims not specifically referred to above are rejected due to their dependence on a rejected base claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen et al, US Patent 6178511, in view of Levergood et al, US Patent 5708780.

Cohen discloses a system used by a first application including an authentication processor (Figure 2, Authentication Module 21) that receives user identification information and initiates authentication of the user identification information using an authentication service (column 6, lines 8-18) and a communication processor that communicates an authentication service identifier and a corresponding user identifier to a managing application (column 6, lines 26-37). Cohen further discloses the use of a user identifier (column 4, line 64-column 5, line 2). However, Cohen does not explicitly disclose automatically communicating context information in a data field of a URL to a second application in response a user command to initiate execution of the second application, nor does Cohen explicitly disclose encrypting a URL address portion.

Levergood discloses a system that includes an authentication processor (column 6, lines 36-42) and that, when a user requests execution of a second application, automatically communicates specific context information in a data field of a URL to the second application (see column 4, lines 1-18). Further, Levergood discloses that the

specific context information is a user identifier (column 5, lines 56-61) and that a URL address portion is encrypted and incorporated into the URL (column 5, lines 61-65; column 3, lines 34-37, noting that the SID includes a domain that is included under the digital signature). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Cohen by including the automatic communication described by Levergood, in order to allow access to all controlled files within a specific domain without requiring additional authorization beyond the initial authorization (see Levergood, column 3, lines 50-55).

9. Claims 1 and 3-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen in view of Levergood and de la Huerga et al, US Patent 5903889.

In reference to Claim 1, Cohen discloses a system used by a first application including an authentication processor (Figure 2, Authentication Module 21) that receives user identification information and initiates authentication of the user identification information using an authentication service (column 6, lines 8-18) and a communication processor that communicates an authentication service identifier and a corresponding user identifier to a managing application (column 6, lines 26-37). However, Cohen does not explicitly disclose automatically communicating context information in a data field of a URL to a second application in response a user command to initiate execution of the second application.

Levergood discloses a system that includes an authentication processor (column 6, lines 36-42) and that, when a user requests execution of a second application,

automatically communicates specific context information in a data field of a URL to the second application (see column 4, lines 1-18). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Cohen by including the automatic communication described by Levergood, in order to allow access to all controlled files within a specific domain without requiring additional authorization beyond the initial authorization (see Levergood, column 3, lines 50-55). However, although Levergood discloses a session identifier (column 3, lines 12-16), neither Levergood nor Cohen explicitly discloses that the application specific context information is communicated separately from a session identifier.

De la Huerga discloses a system for linking various types of data records over several systems, and further that the system includes URL addresses that include application specific context information and session identification information transmitted in separate fields of the URL (see column 10, lines 43-59, where the context information includes the patient identifier, and the URL also includes date/time/report designation information indicative of a particular session; see also Figure 14A). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the system of Cohen and Levergood by including separate URL fields as taught by de la Huerga, in order to allow for economical and easy access to information, particularly medical records, stored in various distributed databases (see de la Huerga, column 2, lines 40-62).

In reference to Claim 3, Cohen further discloses that the user identification information includes a password (column 4, line 64-column 5, line 2). Further,

Levergood discloses the use of a password (column 6, lines 47-49) and the use of a session identifier (see column 3, lines 12-16, where SID is a session identifier).

Additionally, de la Huerga discloses that application specific context information is a patient identifier (column 10, lines 49-52).

In reference to Claims 4 and 5, Cohen further discloses compiling a database accessible to other applications for mapping a user identifier of one application to an already authenticated user identifier of another application (column 4, line 61-column 5, line 6, and column 5, lines 16-22; also noting column 5, lines 45-58, where the database can be updated dynamically).

In reference to Claim 6, Cohen discloses a system including an authentication processor that receives and compiles into a database pairs of authentication service identifiers and user identifiers (column 4, line 61-column 5, line 6) and maps a user identifier of a second application to an already authenticated user identifier of a first application (column 6, lines 26-37). Cohen further discloses a communication processor that sends the authenticated user identifier to the second application (column 6, lines 38-45). However, Cohen does not explicitly disclose automatically communicating context information in a data field of a URL to the second application in response a user command to initiate execution of the second application.

Levergood discloses a system that includes an authentication processor (column 6, lines 36-42) and that, when a user requests execution of a second application, automatically communicates specific context information in a data field of a URL to the

second application (see column 4, lines 1-18). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Cohen by including the automatic communication described by Levergood, in order to allow access to all controlled files within a specific domain without requiring additional authorization beyond the initial authorization (see Levergood, column 3, lines 50-55). However, although Levergood discloses a session identifier (column 3, lines 12-16), neither Levergood nor Cohen explicitly discloses that the application specific context information is communicated separately from a session identifier.

De la Huerga discloses a system for linking various types of data records over several systems, and further that the system includes URL addresses that include application specific context information and session identification information transmitted in separate fields of the URL (see column 10, lines 43-59, where the context information includes the patient identifier, and the URL also includes date/time/report designation information indicative of a particular session; see also Figure 14A). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the system of Cohen and Levergood by including separate URL fields as taught by de la Huerga, in order to allow for economical and easy access to information, particularly medical records, stored in various distributed databases (see de la Huerga, column 2, lines 40-62).

In reference to Claim 7, Cohen further discloses identifying an authentication service that provides an authenticated user identifier (column 4, lines 48-50).

In reference to Claim 8, Cohen further discloses matching the authentication service identifier of the second application with the authentication service identifier of the first application (column 6, lines 26-37).

In reference to Claim 9, Levergood further discloses the use of a session identifier (see column 3, lines 12-16, where SID is a session identifier) and that a URL address portion is encrypted and incorporated into the URL (column 5, lines 61-65; column 3, lines 34-37, noting that the SID includes a domain that is included under the digital signature). Levergood additionally discloses that a key allowing for decryption is accessible to multiple applications (column 5, lines 61-65, where the key is shared by the authentication and content servers).

In reference to Claim 10, Cohen further discloses that the authenticated user identifier of the first application is used by the second application (column 6, lines 38-45), thus eliminating the need for the second application to authenticate the user (column 2, lines 28-31).

In reference to Claim 11, Cohen further discloses sending a parameter identifying success or failure of the mapping (column 10, lines 35-37, where the return codes indicate success or failure of an operation).

In reference to Claim 12, Cohen further discloses that the authentication processor receives an authentication service identifier and user identifier from the first application (column 6, lines 13-29).

In reference to Claim 13, Cohen further discloses that the authentication service identifier employs a predetermined data format (column 5, lines 30-44, and column 5, line 63-column 6, line 7).

In reference to Claim 14, Cohen discloses a system including an authentication processor that receives an authentication service identifier and a user identifier from a parent application (column 4, line 61-column 5, line 6) and maps a user identifier of a child application to an already authenticated user identifier of the parent application (column 6, lines 26-37). Cohen further discloses a communication processor that communicates the authenticated user identifier to the child application (column 6, lines 38-45). However, Cohen does not explicitly disclose automatically communicating context information in a data field of a URL to the child application in response a user command to initiate execution of the child application.

Levergood discloses a system that includes an authentication processor (column 6, lines 36-42) and that, when a user requests execution of a second (child) application, automatically communicates specific context information in a data field of a URL to the second application (see column 4, lines 1-18). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Cohen by including the automatic communication described by Levergood, in order to allow access to all controlled files within a specific domain without requiring additional authorization beyond the initial authorization (see Levergood, column 3, lines 50-55). However, although Levergood discloses a session identifier (column 3, lines 12-16),

neither Levergood nor Cohen explicitly discloses that the application specific context information is communicated separately from a session identifier.

De la Huerga discloses a system for linking various types of data records over several systems, and further that the system includes URL addresses that include application specific context information and session identification information transmitted in separate fields of the URL (see column 10, lines 43-59, where the context information includes the patient identifier, and the URL also includes date/time/report designation information indicative of a particular session; see also Figure 14A). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the system of Cohen and Levergood by including separate URL fields as taught by de la Huerga, in order to allow for economical and easy access to information, particularly medical records, stored in various distributed databases (see de la Huerga, column 2, lines 40-62).

In reference to Claim 15, Cohen further discloses that the parent application begins a session and the child application uses the authentication system to join the session (column 6, lines 38-45). Levergood further discloses a session (note column 3, lines 12-16, where a session is identified by SID).

In reference to Claim 16, Cohen further discloses that the authentication processor compiles a database using pairs of authentication service identifiers and corresponding user identifiers (column 4, line 61-column 5, line 6) and uses the database in mapping the user identifier of the child application to the already authenticated user identifier of the parent application (column 6, lines 26-37).

In reference to Claim 17, Cohen further discloses matching the authentication service identifier of the child application with the authentication service identifier of the parent application (column 6, lines 26-37).

In reference to Claim 18, Cohen further discloses identifying an authentication service that provides an authenticated user identifier (column 4, lines 48-50).

In reference to Claim 19, Cohen further discloses that the authenticated user identifier of the parent application is used by the child application (column 6, lines 38-45), thus eliminating the need for the child application to authenticate the user (column 2, lines 28-31). Additionally, de la Huerga discloses that application specific context information is a patient identifier (column 10, lines 49-52).

In reference to Claim 20, Cohen further discloses that the child application enables access in response to receiving the authenticated user identifier without the user re-entering the user identification information (column 2, lines 28-31, and column 6, lines 38-45).

Claims 21 and 22 are method claims that correspond substantially to the systems of claims 14 and 16 respectively, and are rejected by a similar rationale.

Claim 23 is a method claim that corresponds substantially to the system of claim 1, and is accordingly rejected by a similar rationale.

***Conclusion***

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

a. Jain et al, US Patent Application Publication 2002/0107772, discloses a method for transmitting data between applications where session identification information, session context information, and single sign-on information are transmitted in separate fields.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Zachary A. Davis whose telephone number is (571) 272-3870. The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays 8:30-6:00, alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on (571) 272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

*zad*  
zad

*E. Moise*  
EMMANUEL L. MOISE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER